

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DOUGLAS J. STEVENSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

K. HOLLAND, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:16-cv-01831-AWI-JLT

ORDER AFTER IN CAMERA REVIEW
(Doc. 57)

At the request of counsel, the Court has conducted an in camera review of documents produced to the Court, which are responsive to production requests. The Court will order production of some of the records. In doing so, the Court makes no comment as to the admissibility of these documents nor does it make any finding that the privileges asserted may not be asserted at trial.

The Court **ORDERS** the defendants to disclose the following redacted¹ documents:

1. Documents with Bates numbers 250-287, 327-338, 386-423, 427-428, 442, 444, 455

Despite its earlier order, the Court **DECLINES** to maintain the records that it has not ordered to be disclosed. Rather, the defense **SHALL** maintain them and produce them, if ordered,

¹ Redaction should occur to obliterate the personal identifiers of witnesses and complainants as well as the identifiers of other involved correctional staff.

1 for purposes of appeal.

2

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4

5 Dated: June 12, 2019

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE